

AP
IFW



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Evan HILDRETH et al. Art Unit : 2673
Serial No. : 09/909,857 Examiner : P. Dharia
Filed : July 23, 2001
Title : VIDEO-BASED IMAGE CONTROL SYSTEM

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF MAY 4, 2005

In reply to the Final Office Action of May 4, 2005, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Claims 1-98 are pending, of which claims 1, 50, 54, 68, 71, 80, and 85 are independent.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-12, 23, and 54-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication 2004/0046736 to Pryor (Pryor). Claims 13-22 and 24-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,918 to Gordon (Gordon) and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,125,198 to Onda (Onda). Claims 71-91 and 96-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor in view of U.S. Publication 2001/0033675 to Maurer et. al. (Maurer).

Claims 92-95 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 92-95.

Regarding the rejections of independent claims 1, 50, 54, 68, 71, 80, and 85, Applicant respectfully submits that Pryor, Gordon, Onda, and Maurer do not disclose or fairly suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims. More particularly, the art of record does not disclose or fairly suggest the limitation of "defining an object detection region within a field of view of the stereo image and smaller than the field of view ... to determine position information of an object in the object detection region with respect to the object detection region" (claim 1; see also claims 50, 54, 68, 71, 80, and 85 having similar recitations).